CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

NOTICE TO INTERESTED PARTIES

The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) is required by federal law to submit Appendix H-Caseload reduction Report (ACF-202 form) to the Administration for Children and Families. This report is for Federal Fiscal Year 2007, for the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families program and must be submitted by December 31, 2006.

Notice is hereby given that a copy of the California's TANF Caseload Reduction Report for Federal Fiscal Year 2007 is available on the CDSS website at http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/cdssweb/SpecialNot_1232.htm or upon request from the office below.

Comments relating to California's Caseload Reduction report may be submitted in writing or fax to the address/number listed below. All comments must be received on later than 5:00 pm on December 22, 2006.

CONTACT

June DeVoe Administration Division 744 P Street, MS 12-57 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 653-0843 Fax (916) 653-5404

tate:	California – O	verall	Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2007
***************************************	Overall Report Two-parent Report	(check one)	Apply the overall credit to the two-parentyes participation rate?
			ility Changes Made Since FY 2005 this section for EACH change)
. Na	ame of eligibility chan	ge: Tribal TANF	
. Im	plementation date of	eligibility change: C	October 1, 2005
. De	escription of policy, in	cluding the change	from prior policy:
	Cases transferred fro	om county caseload	to a Tribal TANF program.
	*	~~	culate the estimated impact of this eligibility change
(a	ttach supporting mater	,	
	The stated impact of TANF programs. So		on the count of cash cases transferred from counties to Tribal

Sta	ate: California – Overall	Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2007
1.	Name of eligibility change: Removal of Durational	Sanction
2.	Implementation date of eligibility change: July 12, 2	006
3.	Description of policy, including the change from price	or policy:
	Prior policy required that individuals in the CalW minimum of three or six months for their second, respectively. Effective July 12, 2006, any sanctic contacts the county and performs the activity he can be seen to be seen as the county and performs the activity he can be seen as the county and performs the activity he can be seen as the county and performs the activity he can be seen as the calW minimum of three prior to be seen as	on can end at the point a noncompliant individual
	involved. The removal of a sanction allows the a	s open due to the continued presence of the child(ren) dult back into the authorized unit (AU), increasing the y affect the grant cost, not the size of the State's caseload.
4.	Description of the methodology used to calculate the (attach supporting materials to this form)	estimated impact of this eligibility change:
	continued presence of the child(ren) involved. T	may be sanctioned, the case remains open due to the he removal of a sanction allows the adult back into Therefore, this sanction change will only affect the
5.	Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility	change on caseload in comparison year:0

Sta	te: California – Overall Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2007
1.	Name of eligibility change: Increase in Minimum Basic Standards of Adequate Care (MBSAC)
2.	Implementation date of eligibility change: July 1, 2006
3.	Description of policy, including the change from prior policy:
	The MBSAC was increased by 3.75% due to a cost of living adjustment (COLA). The new MBSAC levels have the effect of changing the applicant financial eligibility test by increasing the amount of income a family could have and still qualify for aid. The MBSAC went up from \$953 for a family of three to \$989, increasing the amount of income the family could have and still be CalWORKs eligible. The applicant family's income, exclusive of the first \$90 of earned income for each employed person, must be less than the MBSAC in order for the family to be eligible for cash aid.
	The MBSAC is also used in determining the value of in-kind income for CalWORKs.
4.	Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form)
	No impact to FFY 2006 caseload. An All County Letter issued November 3, 2006 applied the change retroactively to July 1, 2006. Any impact will occur in FFY 2007.
	See Attachment B.
5.	Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year:0

Sta	ate: California – Overall	Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2007
1.	Name of eligibility change: CalWORKs EA	Foster Care
2.	Implementation date of eligibility change: July	y 1, 2006
3.	Description of policy, including the change from	om prior policy:
		tance Foster Care (EA Foster Care) program was funded with ing was transferred to the State of California's General Fund.
4.	Description of the methodology used to calcul (attach supporting materials to this form)	ate the estimated impact of this eligibility change:
	General Fund. We summed the number of	der TANF funding were transferred to the State's f transferred cases for July, August and September, 2006. and after the removal of the EA Foster Care cases produced an
	2006 Total Average Caseload including E Cases for 12 months	A Foster Care 488,776
	Average Caseload after removal of Foster effective 7/1/06 including cases for 9 mon	
	Net Impact	-887
5.	Estimated average monthly impact of this elig	sibility change on caseload in comparison year: -887

State: California — Overall Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2007

PART 2 - Estimate of Caseload Reduction Credit

Impact of All Changes		Caseload Reduction Calculation		
Tribal TANF	-32	FY 2005 TANF Caseload	468,099	
Removal of Durational Sanction	0	FY 2005 SSP Caseload	38,397	
Increase in Minimum MBSAC	0	Total FY 2005 Caseload	506,496	
CalWORKs EA Foster Care	-887	FY 2006 TANF Caseload	453,525	
		FY 2006 SSP Caseload	34,364	
		Total FY 2006 Caseload	487,889	
		Actual Decline	18,607	3.7%
		Decline – Net Impact	17,688	

Caseload Reduction Credit = 3.5%

Net Impact -919

State: California — Overall Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2007

ACF 202 - FFY 2007 Attachment A

Tribal TANF

	Cases Transfered from Counties to Tribal TANF ¹
FFY 2006	
First Quarter-	
October	47
November	34
December	30
Second Quarter-	
January	27
February ²	26
March ²	25
Third Quarter-	
April ²	32
May ²	33
June ²	39
Fourth Quarter-	
July ²	33
August ²	31
September ²	30
FFY Average ³	-32

¹ The Tribes and Tribal Consortia included in these data are:

California Tribal TANF Partnership (Feb - Sep 06, est.),

Hoopa Valley Tribe (Jul - Sep 06, est.),

North Fork Rancheria (Jul - Sep 06, est.),

Owens Valley Career Development Center,

Southern California Tribal Chairman's Association (Jul - Sep 06, est.),

Torres Martinez Tribal TANF (Apr - Sep 06, est.), and

Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California (Jul - Sep 06, est.)

² Estimated monthly cases transferred, actual data were not available for all months at the date of submission. An average submission. An average of the reported data was applied to the missing months for the remainder of the Federal Fiscal Year.

³ Displayed as a negative number to denote the loss of caseload from California CalWORKs program to Tribal TANF Programs.

State: California — Overall

Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2007

ACF 202 - FFY 2007 Attachment B

Minimum Basic Standards of Adequate Care

CalWORKs Disregard S	ystem
Gross Earnings	\$1,043
\$90 Work Disregard	-\$90
Net Non-Exempt Earnings	\$953

Family of Three

MBSAC	\$953
Net Non-Exempt Earnings	\$953
AFDC Grant	\$0

MBSAC Levels

October 2004 levels for a family of three:

MBSAC = \$953

July 2006 levels for a family of three:

MBSAC = \$953

Definitions

MBSAC = Minimum Basic Standard of Adequate Care CalWORKs = California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids program

State:		Fiscal Year to which credit applies:	2007
State.	Carror ma — Over an	ribent rear to which create appliest	

PART 3 -- Certification

I certify that we have provided the public an appropriate opportunity to comment on the estimates and methodology used to complete this report and considered those comments in completing it. Further, I certify that this report incorporates all reductions in the caseload resulting from State eligibility changes and changes in Federal requirements since Fiscal Year 2005.

(signature)
(name)
(title)
(allo)

	te: California – Two-Parent	Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2007
	Overall Report (check one)	Apply the overall credit to the two-parentyes participation rate?✓_ no
		Changes Made Since FY 2005 ection for EACH change)
1.	Name of eligibility change: Tribal TANF	
2.	Implementation date of eligibility change: Octobe	er 1, 2005
3.	Description of policy, including the change from 1	prior policy:
	Cases transferred from county caseload to a Tr	ribal TANF program.
4.		
	(attach supporting materials to this form):	the estimated impact of this eligibility change
	(attach supporting materials to this form):	the estimated impact of this eligibility change count of cash cases transferred from counties to Tribal
	(attach supporting materials to this form): The stated impact of -32 cases is based on the	count of cash cases transferred from counties to Tribal
	(attach supporting materials to this form): The stated impact of -32 cases is based on the TANF programs. See Attachment A. We then applied the State's average of Two P FFY 2006 Two-Par	count of cash cases transferred from counties to Tribal arent cases to the impact: ent Cases 34,364
	(attach supporting materials to this form): The stated impact of -32 cases is based on the TANF programs. See Attachment A. We then applied the State's average of Two P FFY 2006 Two-Par FFY 2006 To	count of cash cases transferred from counties to Tribal arent cases to the impact: rent Cases 34,364 otal Cases + 487,889
	(attach supporting materials to this form): The stated impact of -32 cases is based on the TANF programs. See Attachment A. We then applied the State's average of Two P FFY 2006 Two-Par FFY 2006 To State's percent of Two-Par	count of cash cases transferred from counties to Tribal arent cases to the impact: rent Cases 34,364 rent Cases + 487,889 rent Cases 7%
	(attach supporting materials to this form): The stated impact of -32 cases is based on the TANF programs. See Attachment A. We then applied the State's average of Two P FFY 2006 Two-Par FFY 2006 To State's percent of Two-Par Impact of Tri	count of cash cases transferred from counties to Tribal arent cases to the impact: rent Cases 34,364 rent Cases \div 487,889 rent Cases 7% bal Cases -32
	(attach supporting materials to this form): The stated impact of -32 cases is based on the TANF programs. See Attachment A. We then applied the State's average of Two P FFY 2006 Two-Par FFY 2006 To State's percent of Two-Par	count of cash cases transferred from counties to Tribal arent cases to the impact: The case Solution of the case of the impact in the case of the ca
	(attach supporting materials to this form): The stated impact of -32 cases is based on the TANF programs. See Attachment A. We then applied the State's average of Two P FFY 2006 Two-Par FFY 2006 To State's percent of Two-Par Impact of Tri State's percent of Two-Parent Cases for I	count of cash cases transferred from counties to Tribal arent cases to the impact: The case Solution of the case of the impact in the case of the ca
	(attach supporting materials to this form): The stated impact of -32 cases is based on the TANF programs. See Attachment A. We then applied the State's average of Two P FFY 2006 Two-Par FFY 2006 To State's percent of Two-Par Impact of Tri State's percent of Two-Parent Cases for I	count of cash cases transferred from counties to Tribal arent cases to the impact: rent Cases $34,364$ rent Cases $\div 487,889$ rent Cases 7% bal Cases -32 FFY 2006 $\times 7\%$
	(attach supporting materials to this form): The stated impact of -32 cases is based on the TANF programs. See Attachment A. We then applied the State's average of Two P FFY 2006 Two-Par FFY 2006 To State's percent of Two-Par Impact of Tri State's percent of Two-Parent Cases for I	count of cash cases transferred from counties to Tribal arent cases to the impact: The case Solution of the case of the impact in the case of the ca
	(attach supporting materials to this form): The stated impact of -32 cases is based on the TANF programs. See Attachment A. We then applied the State's average of Two P FFY 2006 Two-Par FFY 2006 To State's percent of Two-Par Impact of Tri State's percent of Two-Parent Cases for I	count of cash cases transferred from counties to Tribal arent cases to the impact: The case Solution of the case of the impact in the case of the ca

Sta	nte: California – Two-Parent Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2007
1.	Name of eligibility change: Removal of Durational Sanction
2.	Implementation date of eligibility change: July 12, 2006
3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy:	
	Prior policy required that individuals in the CalWORKs Welfare-to-Work program be sanctioned for a minimum of three or six months for their second, third or subsequent instance of noncompliance, respectively. Effective July 12, 2006, any sanction can end at the point a noncompliant individual contacts the county and performs the activity he or she previously failed or refused to perform.
	While adults may be sanctioned, the case remains open due to the continued presence of the child(ren) involved. The removal of a sanction allows the adult back into the authorized unit (AU), increasing the AU size. Therefore, this sanction change will only affect the grant cost, not the size of the State's caseload.
4.	Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form)
	No impact to FFY 2006 caseload. While adults may be sanctioned, the case remains open due to the continued presence of the child(ren) involved. The removal of a sanction allows the adult back into the authorized unit (AU), increasing the AU size. Therefore, this sanction change will only affect the grant cost, not the size of the State's caseload.
5.	Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year:0

Sta	te: California – Two-Parent Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2007		
1.	Name of eligibility change: Increase in Minimum Basic Standards of Adequate Care (MBSAC)		
2.	Implementation date of eligibility change: July 1, 2006		
3.	Description of policy, including the change from prior policy:		
	The MBSAC was increased by 3.75% due to a cost of living adjustment (COLA). The new MBSAC levels have the effect of changing the applicant financial eligibility test by increasing the amount of income a family could have and still qualify for aid. The MBSAC went up from \$953 for a family of three to \$989, increasing the amount of income the family could have and still be CalWORKs eligible. The applicant family's income, exclusive of the first \$90 of earned income for each employed person, must be less than the MBSAC in order for the family to be eligible for cash aid.		
	The MBSAC is also used in determining the value of in-kind income for CalWORKs.		
4.	Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form)		
	No impact to FFY 2006 caseload. An All County Letter issued November 3, 2006 applied the change retroactively to July 1, 2006. Any impact will occur in FFY 2007.		
	See Attachment B.		
5.	Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year:0		

California — Two-Parent

Fiscal Year to which credit applies:

2007

PART 2 - Estimate of Caseload Reduction Credit

Impact of All Changes	Caseload Reduction Calculation			
Tribal TANF	-2	FY 2005 TANF Caseload		
Removal of Durational Sanction	0	FY 2005 SSP Caseload	38,397	
Increase in Minimum MBSAC	0	Total FY 2005 Caseload	38,397	
		FY 2006 TANF Caseload		
		FY 2006 SSP Caseload	34,364	
		Total FY 2006 Caseload	34,364	
		Actual Decline	4,033	10.5%
		Decline – Net Impact	4,031	

Caseload Reduction Credit = 10.5%

Net Impact -2

State: California — Two-Parent Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2007

ACF 202 - FFY 2007 Attachment A

Tribal TANF

	Cases Transfered from Counties to Tribal TANF ¹
FFY 2006	
First Quarter-	
October	47
November	34
December	30
Second Quarter-	
January	27
February ²	26
March ²	25
Third Quarter-	
April ²	32
May ²	33
June ²	39
Fourth Quarter-	
July ²	33
August ²	31
September ²	30
FFY Average ³	-32

¹ The Tribes and Tribal Consortia included in these data are:

California Tribal TANF Partnership (Feb - Sep 06, est.),

Hoopa Valley Tribe (Jul - Sep 06, est.),

North Fork Rancheria (Jul - Sep 06, est.),

Owens Valley Career Development Center,

Southern California Tribal Chairman's Association (Jul - Sep 06, est.),

Torres Martinez Tribal TANF (Apr - Sep 06, est.), and

Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California (Jul - Sep 06, est.)

² Estimated monthly cases transferred, actual data were not available for all months at the date of submission. An average submission. An average of the reported data was applied to the missing months for the remainder of the Federal Fiscal Year.

³ Displayed as a negative number to denote the loss of caseload from California CalWORKs program to Tribal TANF Programs.

State: California — Two-Parent Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2007

ACF 202 - FFY 2007 Attachment B

Minimum Basic Standards of Adequate Care

CalWORKs Disregard System		
Gross Earnings	\$1,043	
\$90 Work Disregard	-\$90	
Net Non-Exempt Earnings	\$953	

Family of Three

MBSAC	\$953
Net Non-Exempt Earnings	\$953
AFDC Grant	\$0

MBSAC Levels

October 2004 levels for a family of three:

MBSAC = \$953

July 2006 levels for a family of three:

MBSAC = \$953

Definitions

MBSAC = Minimum Basic Standard of Adequate Care CalWORKs = California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids program

State:	California – Two-Parent	Fiscal Year to which credit applies:	_2007

PART 3 -- Certification

I certify that we have provided the public an appropriate opportunity to comment on the estimates and methodology used to complete this report and considered those comments in completing it. Further, I certify that this report incorporates all reductions in the caseload resulting from State eligibility changes and changes in Federal requirements since Fiscal Year 2005.

(signature)
(name)
(title)